

**REMARKS**

**Status of Pending Claims**

Prior to entering of the amendments, Claims 47-56 are canceled as drawn to non-elected invention. Claims 4, 5, 13, and 24-46 are withdrawn as drawn to non-elected species.

**Amendments**

The specification is amended to correct typographical errors.

Claim 1 is amended to recite an electrophoretic display. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at paragraph [0025], [0059], and original Claims 1 and 2. Consequently, Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claims 4, 8, 9, 41 and 49 have been cancelled because of the use of trademarks. Claims 13 and 30 have been amended to delete the trademarks.

Claim 16 has been cancelled because it has the same scope as Claim 11.

Claim 31 has been cancelled because it has the same scope of Claim 28.

The other amendments are for clarity only.

No new matter is introduced.

**Prior Restriction Requirement**

In the Office Action dated October 6, 2005, the Examiner required Applicants to elect one of the two inventions:

- I. Claims 1-46, drawn to compositions.
- II. Claims 47-56, drawn to method of sealing electrophoresis display cells.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants elected Group I, Claims 1-46. However, Applicants have just realized that Claims 52-55 were directed to an electrophoretic display, not to a method of sealing electrophoresis display cells.

The current amendment amends Claim 1 to an electrophoretic display comprising display cells sealed with a sealing layer formed from a sealing composition. The sealing composition was of the same scope of the original Claims 1 and 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment and re-consider the application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-12, 14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nagai et al (US Patent 5,326,846). Claim 16 is canceled. The rejection of the remaining claims is overcome in view of the claim amendment.

Nagai et al disclose a process for producing an impact-resistant polyacetal resin composition. The process involves mixing, with shear, a polyacetal resin with certain substances. The process is demonstrated in the examples where it was carried out on compositions containing predominantly a polyacetal resin. The object of Nagai et al was to provide a polyacetal resin composition which “gives injection-molded shaped articles showing well-balanced various physical properties” (see column 2, lines 1-3). Nagai et al do not disclose an electrophoretic display, let alone display cells filled with an electrophoretic fluid and sealed with a sealing layer formed from a sealing composition (Claim 1).

Therefore, the §102(b) rejection of Claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 8, 9, 15, 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nagai et al. Claims 8 and 9 are canceled. The rejection of the remaining claims is overcome in view of the amendment.


As discussed above, Nagai et al do not disclose an electrophoretic display, let alone display cells filled with an electrophoretic fluid and sealed with a sealing layer formed from a sealing composition. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 15, and 19-23 should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the application is in good and proper condition for allowance.  
Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 7, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Viola T. Kung (Reg. No. 41,131)

**HOWREY, LLP**  
2941 Fairview Park Drive  
Box 7  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Ph. (650) 798-3570  
Fax (650) 798-3600